

C. Remarks

Based on the amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the office action, claims 10-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by 'Nelson et al. (USPG Pub. 2003/0055975)'.

In response to this office action, claims 10,17,18,19, and 23 have been currently amended.

C.1. Descriptions and Differences of the Claims from the Cited Art:

Independent Claim 10 and Claims 11-22

Claim 10 recites determining a number of objects in the resource and the size of each object. However, the cited art, Nelson, does not disclose or suggest determining the number of objects in the resource, nor does it disclose or suggest determining the size of each object in the resource. The cited portions, paragraph [0054] and [0058], of Nelson merely disclose different multiplexing, compression, and communication services for transmitting information. These cited sections of Nelson do not teach or suggest determining the number of objects in the resource, much less determining the size of each object in the resource. Thus, Nelson does not teach or suggest the features of claim 10.

Moreover, to further prosecution of the present application, claim 10 has been amended to recite that at least one available wireless network interface is

assigned to each object, at least one object in the resource being assigned a different available wireless network interface than another object in the same resource. In contrast, Nelson describes different bearer services, which can be used to deliver data communication services. Further, Nelson does not indicate that a resource having a plurality of objects have at least one object in a resource that is assigned to a different wireless network interface than another object in the same resource as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claim 10 distinguishes over the cited references, and the rejection of claims 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-22 depend from claim 10, and thus are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 16 further recites wherein determining a number of objects in the resource and the size of each object comprises querying the remote computer. In contrast, Nelson recites that a request for a service from a mobile computing device is received by a Broad Band Unit (BBU), which is present inside a Airborne Communication Unit (ACU). The BBU checks the availability of radio and server resources, to establish a link with a ground station. The cited portion, paragraph [0083], of Nelson does not teach or suggest querying a remote computer, which has the resource, to determine the number of objects in the resource and the size of each object. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

that claim 16 distinguishes over the cited references, and the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 17-19, as amended further, recite wherein assigning each object to at least one available wireless network interface comprises assigning an object to two or more wireless network interfaces if the size of the object exceeds a threshold. In contrast, the cited portions, paragraph [0047], [0048], and [0049], of Nelson discloses various data link options for the data communication server to connect to the ground based servers. Further, it discloses an architecture in which the PPP frames from the data communication server to the ground servers are tunneled via an L2TP. However, it does not teach or suggest assigning an object to two or more wireless network interfaces, much less assigning an object to two or more interfaces if the size exceeds a threshold as recited in claims 17-19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claim 17-19 distinguishes over the cited references, and the rejection of claims 17-19 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 23 and Claims 24-35

Independent claim 23 recites a processor executing logic instruction that configure the processor to assign each object at least one available wireless network interface, at least one object in the resource being assigned a different available wireless network interface than another object in the same resource. In contrast, Nelson discloses different bearer services which can be used to deliver data communication services – however, a single bearer service is used for all

objects within the same resource. Therefore, Nelson does not indicate that at least one object, in a resource that has a plurality of objects, be assigned to a different wireless network interface than another object in the same resource as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claim 23 distinguishes over the cited references, and the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

Claims 24-35 depend from claim 23, and thus, are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

C.2. Conclusion

The present claims have been explained to highlight the differences of the recited invention over the cited art and are respectfully submitted that the claims are now clearly patentable over the art of record, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone the applicants' attorney at the numbers listed below prior to issuing a further Office Action.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 12/12/06

By: 

Carole A. Boelitz, Reg. No.: 48,958

Attorney for Applicants

Direct telephone: (425) 722-6035

Microsoft Corporation

One Microsoft Way

Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 12, 2006
Date


Signature

Kate Marochkina
Type or Print Name